

ECC 2002-05-30-4-52

MGFA-6461

P-2812

SECRET

SECURITY INFORMATION

PASTIME GEN'L

Chief, EE

ATTN: []

Chief of Station, Frankfurt

OPERATIONAL

Pastime Planning

Ref: MGFA-6302, MGQW-13049

14 April 1952

CH	W	TC	TB	—
DEP		TCD	TBD	—
SP	RAD	—	—	—
SED		—	OTM	—
(WP)	W	—	—	—
(RCD)	RCD	—	—	—
FILED PASTIME				

1. We appreciate your comments on MGFA-6302, both as approval for our previous work and encouragement for future effort, and we take your memo as opportune guidance to [] who is replacing [] in these field operations.

2. Further, we take this occasion to firm-up your paragraph 4 relating to paragraph 9 of MGFA-6302. Yes, it is our thought that we should have blanket approval for the plan mentioned. In essence, this is not far from previously approved methods of operations, especially in that part where we suggest more than one communications cache be made for each agent. That is, one operational set and one reserve set. Now after further thinking, we arrive at the conclusion as stated -- that three or four such caches be made for each agent so that rather than having to transport this equipment from one spot to the other to frustrate DFing, that he have his equipment already dispersed and he need only carry his selected crystals and encoded message to his selected site of operation.

3. And, where we see opportunity for a more elaborate, more practical cache, such as above ground and even pre-fitted operational bases, we feel that the case officer should be free to act immediately on his own judgment. It should be understood that the limited personnel available for this project will hold down developments in this field to no more than one or two such developments in any one project period, with an estimated cost of less than DM 5,000. With this as a criterion, we would request approval for the case officer to proceed in this type of development.

4. With reference to the containers required for the basic packaging for the multiple caches as mentioned in paragraph 2, we believe that [] has been able to conclusively discuss this matter with you. However, for the record, we will refer to Field Notice 21-52, 6 February followed by Field Notice 8-52, 15 February. We would find the container type EC-2 particularly desirable because of its reusability as it must be remembered that almost everything

EE-2
GOS-1
FOA-1

SECRET

COPY

MAY 12 1952

SECURITY INFORMATION

**SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION**

- 2 -

that an agent recovers from his operational cache has to be re-cached and therefore all containers must be resealed.

5. These containers should be of dimensions to accommodate the radio components, batteries, generator, etc., with additional selection of containers for caching medicines and weapons. We realize that Washington is aware of the essentials of a "staybehind" cache; what seems to have escaped the planning people is an overall container into which the smaller packages can be placed. This overall container need not be an elaborate type of package. In fact it could be made of light gauge rust-proofed metal or creosote-treated wood. Its prime need is only for maintaining the shape and dimensions of the hole in the ground to re-accommodate the smaller sealable containers. We feel that unless Washington would wish to standardize the production for the manufacturer of this outer container, we can have them manufactured in the field with local headquarters logistical support.

[] [] []

**SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION**